

Message

From: Wright, Matthew@CDPH [Matthew.Wright@cdph.ca.gov]
Sent: 8/23/2018 7:41:01 PM
To: LEE, LILY [LEE.LILY@EPA.GOV]
Subject: FW: Sf Weekly

fyi

From: Pace, Christopher@CDPH
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 10:34 AM
To: Wright, Matthew@CDPH <Matthew.Wright@cdph.ca.gov>
Cc: Pilorin, Ronald@CDPH <Ronald.Pilorin@cdph.ca.gov>
Subject: FW: Sf Weekly

Matt,

In the article in the link below, there is mention (mostly) of other areas at HPNS & Parcel G.
Let me know if anything there is problematic for CDPH.
Can you get back to me by 11:30.

<http://www.sfweekly.com/topstories/toxic-relationship-the-fraud-at-hunters-point/>

Note, Gonzolo will be reviewing the article and emails below, to add whatever should be included with the article authors incomplete characterization of what CDPH is doing at Parcel A...

Comments on the article from Mark (emails):

There are a couple technical corrections (they got my name wrong, and the CDPH & DTSC relation wrong: "two departments within the California Department of Public Health: the **Department of Toxic Substances Control**"), and their representation of our work on Parcel A is quite limited/incomplete (no surprise there). Overall, however, the Navy, EPA and SFDPH would be the ones to comment on this one.

The tone and approach is one of innuendos and accusations, but not sure we can "correct" that. (Perhaps suggest that it be an opinion piece?) They also leave the reader with the impression that contamination is everywhere and moving around, with minimal distinction (i.e., confusion) between Parcel A and other locations...

We'll see if staff have any correction to the "Radiation Survey 700" terminology. But I think that the real problem is what I mentioned – that their representation of our work on Parcel A is quite limited/incomplete (e.g., no mention of the walkover scans, other equipment, why scanning is appropriate, the different purpose of this health and safety survey vs. clean-up evaluation/testing, etc.). They give most of the attention to the advocates' perspective. Here is the key section:

Castleman, Greenaction, and other community advocates have criticized the scanning plan for its lack of soil sampling and for not looking for the things that worry residents on Parcel A. Secondary issues, such as potentially contaminated sewer lines and storm drains once used for the dumping of radioactive waste, remain unaddressed.

When the CDPH scanned the residential site over the last month, it used a Radiation Survey 700, a detection and monitoring system mounted to a cart that combed the streets, sidewalks, and other public spaces around the residents' homes. **Dr. Martin Starr**, CDPH's Deputy Director of the Center for Environmental Health, says it's more effective to do a scan so investigators know where to take a closer look.

"If we were likely to find something, it's likely to be buried," Starr says, intending to reassure. "If it's three feet down, it's not a hazard."

Still, the device is used to detect gamma radionuclides within only about six inches of the surface — a major flaw, says **Daniel Hirsch**, a retired director of U.C. Santa Cruz's Environmental and Nuclear Policy Program, because hazardous radionuclides like plutonium-239 and strontium-90 will fall under the radar.

"The extraordinary defects in the CDPH gamma scan plan make it impossible to detect radiation at the levels that would require cleanup," Hirsch says in an email. "It is like a doctor wearing a blindfold and saying that s/he didn't see any problem. CDPH is wandering around limited portions of Parcel A with the equivalent of a Geiger counter that can't see contamination at the levels of concern."

Thanks,

Chris Pace, REHS
Chief, Environmental Management Branch
California Department of Public Health
MS-7402, IMS K-2
P.O. Box 997377
Sacramento, CA 95899-7377